

III Sutter Street, Suite 700 San Francisco, California 94104 phone 415.617.8900 fax 415.676.3000 www.stoel.com

> Direct i email jf

April 30, 2002

## BY HAND DELIVERY

Jean D. Jewell Idaho Public Utilities Commission 472 West Washington Boise, ID 83702-5983

Re: Case No. PAC-E-02-1

Dear Secretary Jewell:

Enclosed for filing in the above-referenced proceeding, please find an original and 9 copies of the Direct Testimony of PacifiCorp witness Robert Lively, as well as a 3.5" diskette in ASCII format, as required by Rule 231.05.

Very truly yours,

James F Fell

JFF:knp

**Enclosures** 

cc: All parties of record

Oregon
Washington
California
Utah
Idahe
Washington D.C.

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on this <u>30</u> day of April, 2002, a true and correct copy of the

foregoing was served on the following via U.S. mail:

Scott Woodbury Deputy Attorney General Idaho Public Utilities Commission P.O. Box 83720 Boise, ID 83720-0074

Eric Olsen Racine, Olson, Nye, Budge & Bailey P.O. Box 1391 201 E. Center Pocatello, ID 83204-1391

Anthony J. Yankel 29814 Lake Road Bay Village, OH 44140

Randall C. Budge Racine, Olson, Nye, Budge & Bailey P.O. Box 1391 201 E. Center Pocatello, ID 83204-1391

James R. Smith Senior Accounting Specialist Monsanto Company P.O. Box 816 Soda Springs, ID 83276

Mr. Tim Shurtz 411 South Main Firth, Idaho 83236

By:

Regulatory Operations' Coordinator

## BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Application of PacifiCorp,	) CASE NO. PAC-E-02-1
dba Utah Power & Light Company for	)
Approval of its Proposed Electric Service	) APPLICATION OF PACIFICORP
Schedules	)
	)

## **PACIFICORP**

CASE NO. PAC-E-02-1

**Direct Testimony and Exhibits** 

**April 30, 2002** 

## BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Application of PacifiCorp, dba Utah Power & Light Company for Approval of its Proposed Electric Service	) ) )	Case No. PAC-E-02-1
Schedules	) )	

**PACIFICORP** 

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

Robert C. Lively

April 30, 2002

1	Q.	Please state you name and business address.

- 2 A. My name is Robert C. Lively. My business address is One Utah Center, Suite
- 3 2300, 201 South Main Street, Salt Lake City, Utah 84140-2300

## 4 Qualifications

- 5 Q. Please describe your employment history with PacifiCorp (or the "Company").
- 6 A. I joined the Company in 1983 in the accounting department and have held various
- 7 accounting, regulatory, and customer account management positions prior to
- 8 assuming my current position in 1997.
- 9 Q. What is your current position at the Company?
- 10 A. I am Manager, Regulation at PacifiCorp.
- 11 Q. What are your responsibilities as Manager, Regulation?
- 12 A. My responsibilities include management of regulatory proceedings principally in
- Idaho and Utah. This includes management of rate cases, stipulations, contract
- negotiations, and other regulatory proceedings. I also assist and advise in the
- development of the Company's regulatory policy.
- 16 Q. What is your educational background?
- 17 A. I graduated from the University of Utah in 1980 with a Bachelor of Arts Degree in
- Accounting. I am a licensed CPA in the State of Utah and I have served on the
- board of Directors of the Intermountain Electrical Association. I have also
- attended various educational, professional and electric industry related seminars
- 21 during my career at the Company.

Purpose	of	<b>Testimor</b>	ıy
---------	----	-----------------	----

- 2 Q. Are you familiar with the terms and conditions of the Stipulation before the
- 3 Commission?
- 4 A. Yes.

1

- 5 Q. What is the purpose of your testimony.
- 6 A. The purpose of my testimony is twofold: First, I will describe and support the
- 7 Stipulation among Staff of the IPUC ("Staff"), the Company, the Idaho Irrigation
- 8 Pumpers Association ("IIPA") and Monsanto Company ("Monsanto")
- 9 (collectively referred to as the "Parties") in Case No. PAC-E-02-1 (the
- "Stipulation"). The Stipulation, which was filed with the Commission on April
- 11, 2002, is identified as Exhibit No. 20. Second, I will address the matters
- identified as "at issue" in the Commission's Notice of Issue Identification and
- 13 Scheduling.

## 14 Background

- 15 Q. Please describe the events precipitating the Company's application for deferral of
- its excess net power costs.
- 17 A. Beginning in May 2000, electric utilities began to experience an unanticipated and
- extraordinary increase in wholesale power prices. Between May 2000 and
- November 2000 alone, PacifiCorp incurred approximately \$228 million in excess
- 20 net purchased power costs on a total Company basis (approximately \$11 million
- on a Idaho jurisdictional basis). PacifiCorp's situation became even worse in
- November when the Company was forced to purchase additional replacement

power as a result of the forced outage of one of its major generating facilities,
Hunter Unit Number 1.

Faced with an increasing disparity between the purchased power costs it was recovering in its prices and the costs it was incurring, on November 1, 2000, PacifiCorp filed an Application in Case No. PAC-E-00-5 for approval to defer excess net power costs incurred from November 1, 2000 through October 31, 2001. In Commission Order No. 28630, the Commission approved the Company's request for deferred accounting of those excess power costs. That order also permitted the Company to request recovery of carrying charges when it applied for ratemaking treatment of the amounts deferred. Pursuant to the Commission's order, the Company deferred \$37 million in excess power costs, including replacement power costs related to the outage of the Hunter Unit Number 1 generator.

Q. Please describe Exhibit No. 21.

A.

Exhibit No. 21 shows a timeline quantifying the excess purchased net power costs incurred between May 2000 and October 31, 2001. The timeline breaks out the total Idaho-related excess net power costs of \$49 million into two parts. The first part being \$11 million incurred from May 2000 through October 2000. This amount was borne by the Company's shareholders and is not being requested from Idaho customers. The second amount, for which the Company seeks recovery in this proceeding, is the \$38 million of excess net power costs (including \$1 million of carrying charges) incurred from November 1, 2000 through October 31, 2001.

1		The Company's excess power costs were deferred under terms of the
2		Commission's order previously described. The Stipulation, if approved by the
3		Commission, allows the Company to recover \$25 million (or approximately 51%),
4		of the total Idaho-related excess net power costs.
5	Q.	Please describe the background of the Stipulation.
6	A.	On January 7, 2002, PacifiCorp filed the Application in this case seeking to
7		recover over a two year period its deferred excess net power costs, plus carrying
8		charges, amounting to approximately \$38. The Company further proposed
9		electric service schedules that would adjust rates to bring customer classes closer
10		to the cost of serving the respective classes. In addition, the Company proposed a
11		Rate Mitigation Adjustment designed in such a way that no customer class would
12		receive a price increase during the two-year period of the surcharge for recovery
13		of the deferred excess net power costs. Finally, the Company also proposed an
14		increase to the Electric Service Schedule No. 34-BPA Exchange Credit to reflect
15		the increased benefit from settlement with the Bonneville Power Administration
16		regarding residential exchange benefits.
17		On January 31, 2002, in its Order No. 28946, the Commission approved
18		Electric Tariff Schedule 34-BPA Exchange Credit using Modified Procedure, i.e.,
19		by written submission rather than by hearing. The remainder of the Company's
20		filing was processed separately as specified herein.
21		On February 19, 2002, a prehearing conference was held in Boise, Idaho.
22		At that conference, the parties and the Commission identified a nonexclusive list

1	of matters to be "at issue" in this proceeding and the Commission adopted a
2	procedural schedule.

Settlement discussions were held among the parties on March 5, 20 and 28, 2002. As a result of those settlement conferences, the Parties to the Stipulation reached an agreement detailed in the Stipulation and described in the testimony below.

## Terms of Stipulation

3

4

5

6

7

- 8 Q. Please summarize the Stipulation.
- 9 Simply stated, the Stipulation allows the Company to recover approximately 65% A. 10 of its deferred excess purchased power costs (plus carrying charges), or 51% of 11 the total excess purchased power costs it incurred to serve Idaho customers 12 between May 2000 and October 31, 2001. The Parties have agreed to support the 13 Company's recovery, through a surcharge and the acceleration of the "Merger 14 Credit," as described below, of \$25 million of its \$37 million in deferred excess 15 power costs through a Power Cost Surcharge. The Parties have also agreed 1) to 16 the manner in which the revenue obligations will be spread among the classes as 17 reflected in Attachment B to the Stipulation, 2) to redesign Electric Service 18 Schedule 10 in accordance with Attachment C to the Stipulation, and 3) to 19 implement a modified Rate Mitigation Adjustment as a line item charge on 20 customers' bills through Electric Service Schedule 94, Attachment D to the 21 Stipulation. The Parties agree that the Stipulation produces an overall just and 22 reasonable result that is in the public interest.

1	Q.	Please describe how the Company will recover the \$25 million of deferred excess
2		power costs agreed to in the Stipulation.

A.

As a result of the Commission's order ("Merger Order") in the ScottishPower merger case (Case No. PAC-E-99-1), customers have received since January 2000 a credit of approximately \$1.6 million per year from PacifiCorp that has been reflected as a line item on customers' bills pursuant to Electric Service Schedule No. 99 (the "Merger Credit"). If PacifiCorp were to continue the Merger Credit for the full four-year period reflected in the Merger Order, there would be approximately \$2.3 million, on a present value basis, remaining to be credited to customers. Accordingly, the Parties have agreed that to offset PacifiCorp's excess power costs, the Merger Credit and Electric Service Schedule No. 99 should be accelerated and credited to reduce the Company's excess power cost recovery from \$25 million to \$22.7 million.

The Parties also have agreed that PacifiCorp should be allowed to implement a Power Cost Surcharge designed to recover \$22.7 million over a 24-month period beginning May 15, 2002 and ending May 14, 2004. The Power Cost Surcharge will be implemented as a line item charge on customers' bills through Electric Service Schedule No. 93, Attachment A to the Stipulation. As reflected in Attachment A, the Parties have agreed that the Power Cost Surcharge should be tracked and that a true-up surcharge or surcredit may be implemented over a 12-month period immediately following the 24-month Power Cost Surcharge recovery period to reflect any under- or over-collection of the total

1		authorized Power Cost Surcharge amount.
2	Q.	Including the offsets, how much of its excess net power costs will the Company
3		recovery under the Stipulation?
4	A.	As described in PacifiCorp Exhibit No. 21, the Company will recover
5		approximately \$25 million including offsets, representing approximately 65% of
6		deferred excess power costs attributable to Idaho plus carrying charges.
7	Q.	Please describe Attachment B of the Stipulation.
8	A.	Attachment B reflects the Parties' agreement regarding the manner in which the
9		revenue obligations of the various customer classes should be spread among the
10		classes.
11	Q.	Please describe the modified Rate Mitigation Adjustment agreed to in the
12		Stipulation.
13	A.	The Parties were unable to reach agreement regarding the cost of service study
14		and Rate Mitigation Adjustment originally proposed by the Company. Instead,
15		the Stipulation contains an agreed upon "modified" Rate Mitigation Adjustment,
16		which assures that no customer class will see a price increase of more than 4%
17		over the two-year period of the Power Cost Surcharge. The Company supports
18		the modified Rate Mitigation Adjustment included in the Stipulation because it is

directionally consistent with the Cost of Service study originally filed in the

Company's proposal. Additionally, the modified Rate Mitigation Adjustment

customer classes of rate increases related to the excess net power cost recovery.

included in the Stipulation serves the purpose of moderating the impact on

19

20

21

22

The modified Rate Mitigation Adjustment is proposed as a surcharge or
surcredit applied on a cents per kilowatt-hour basis to each rate schedule and will
be shown as a separate line item charge on customers' bills through Electric
Service Schedule No. 94. In year one, the modified Rate Mitigation Adjustment
applies only to commercial, industrial and lighting customers. In year two, the
modified Rate Mitigation Adjustment continues and will apply to all customer
classes. No customer class will receive a price increase in year two. In year three
and subsequent years, the modified Rate Mitigation Adjustment may continue,
subject to termination provisions contained in the Stipulation. The Parties have
agreed that upon the earlier of 1) the expiration of the current Electric Service
Schedule No. 34-BPA Exchange Credit or 2) the adoption by the Commission of a
cost of service study for PacifiCorp and the subsequent implementation for all
customers of the approved cost of service study by any lawful method by the
Commission or PacifiCorp, Electric Service Schedule No. 94 will be terminated.
In comparison to rates in effect during 2001, please describe the overall change
that customers will see in their prices in year one after all of the revenue
components are added.
In year one, residential customers will see an average price decrease of 28%.
Irrigation customers on average will also see a price decrease of approximately
19% while, overall, commercial and industrial customers will see a decrease of
approximately 8%. Lighting customers will see an overall increase of
approximately 2%. This is shown in Attachment B to the Stipulation, Table B1.

Q.

A.

1	Q.	Please describe the overall change that customers will see in their prices in year
2		two after all of the revenue components are added.
3	A.	In year two, no customer class will see a change from prices at the end of year one
4		except irrigation customers. Irrigation customers will see an average decrease of
5		11%. This is shown in Attachment B to the Stipulation, Table B2.
6	Q.	Please describe the changes to Irrigation Schedule 10 agreed to in the Stipulation.
7	A.	The proposed Irrigation Schedule 10 agreed to in the Stipulation consolidates the
8		three rates currently contained in Irrigation Schedule 10 into one firm service rate.
9		Customers previously under the three load-control options have been combined
10		and will now be under one, revenue-neutral, firm service rate. In order to
11		minimize impacts on individual Schedule 10 customers, the proposed service
12		charges and demand charge are calculated as the average of the three current rate
13		options, proportioned for the amount of usage under each of the three rate options.
14		In addition, the two-block current on-season energy charge has been
15		revised to a three-block energy charge. The three-block energy charge is designed
16		to more closely track cost of service while giving more uniform price signals to all
17		irrigation customers.
18	Q.	Please describe other essential terms of the Stipulation.
19	A.	In response to concerns raised by the IIPA concerning the loss of the Schedule 10,
20		Irrigation Season Rate C and its associated load control benefits, PacifiCorp has
21		agreed to discuss individual interruptibility or load control contracts for the 2002
22		irrigation season with not more than 15 large irrigators (defined as irrigators

having an individual meter registering greater than 500 kW demand during the last 12 months) on a first-come, first-served basis. Pacificorp has also agreed that it will work with the IIPA and the irrigators as a class to develop an optional load control program for the 2003 irrigation season and thereafter that would allow an irrigator to participate in such program on an annual basis. The Company has agreed to file its proposed optional load control program with the Commission no later than January 31, 2003.

## 8 Matters "At Issue" in this Proceeding

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

- 9 Q. In its Notice of Issue Identification and Scheduling in this case, the Commission
  10 identified several matters as continuing to be "at issue" in this proceeding. Please
  11 address the Company's position with respect to the first issue identified: the
  12 Company's cost of service study with related adjustments to rate design.
- 13 Mr. Dave Taylor and Mr. James Zhang provided a detailed cost of service study A. 14 and price design proposal as part of the Company's Application in this 15 proceeding. As discussed above, the parties were unable to agree that the Company's proposed cost of service study and related price design were 16 17 appropriate for implementation at this time. Although the Company continues to 18 support the original proposals as filed, the Parties to the Stipulation (including the 19 Company) agreed to a modified Rate Mitigation Adjustment in lieu of the 20 Company's proposed cost of service study and price design.
- Q. Please address the Company's position with respect to the second issue identified:
   the revenue ramifications of the Company's filing.

1	A.	As stated above, the Company supports the modified Rate Mitigation Adjustment
2		included in the Stipulation in part because of the moderating impact it has on
3		customer classes impacted by the excess power cost recovery. Under the
4		Stipulation, some customer classes would face double-digit increases absent the
5		modified Rate Mitigation Adjustment. Instead, with the modified Rate Mitigation
6		Adjustment, increases are limited to 4% over the two year period of the Power
7		Cost Surcharge.
8	Q.	Please address the Company's position with respect to the third issue identified:

- Q. Please address the Company's position with respect to the third issue identified:
   the power costs PacifiCorp is seeking to recover.
- 10 Â. As discussed above, the Company has incurred approximately \$49 million total of 11 excess net purchased power costs, attributable to Idaho between May 2000 and 12 October 31, 2001. \$37 million of this amount was deferred by authorization of 13 the Commission and an additional \$1 million would accrue as carrying charges, if 14 approved. Under terms of the Stipulation, the Company agreed to recovery of \$25 15 million of the \$38 million total. The recovery amount agreed to in the Stipulation 16 represents approximately 51% of the total amount of excess net power costs 17 attributable to Idaho between May 2000 and October 31, 2001, and approximately 18 65% of the amount deferred between November 1, 2000 and October 31, 2001 19 plus carrying charges.
- Q. Please address the Company's position with respect to the fourth issue identified:
   the Rate Mitigation Adjustment originally proposed by the Company.
- As discussed above, the Parties were unable to reach agreement in settlement

1		discussions regarding the Rate Mitigation Adjustment originally proposed by the
2		Company. For purposes of the Stipulation the Company supports the modified
3		Rate Mitigation Adjustment as directionally consistent with the original proposal
4		and also because it moderates the impact of the excess power cost recovery.
5	Q.	Please address the Company's position with respect to the fifth issue identified:
6		whether the Company's attempted recovery of excess power costs incurred in
7		2000/2001 violates Merger Approval Condition No. 2. Reference Case No. PAC-
8		E-99-1, Order No. 28213.
9	A.	The Company agrees with the findings of the Commission in its Order Nos. 28630
10		(Case No. PAC-E-00-5) and 28998 (Case No. PAC-E-02-1). In Order 28630, the
11		Commission found that authorization of PacifiCorp's application for deferred
12		accounting only preserved the amounts deferred for future consideration.
13		Accordingly, the Commission found that "approval of PacifiCorp's Application
14		[for deferral] will not result in a rate increase at this time and thus does not violate
15		the condition that it will not seek a general rate increase effective prior to January
16		1, 2001." Subsequently, in Order 28998, the Commission clarified its Merger
17		Order and stated that the language of Condition 2 prohibited PacifiCorp from
18		seeking a general rate increase effective prior to January 1, 2002. Because
19		PacifiCorp did not seek any increase in rates to be effective before that date, the
20		Commission explained, the Company has fulfilled that Condition. The
21		Commission's clarification of its Condition 2 resolved this issue.
22	Q.	Please address the Company's position with respect to the sixth issue identified:

1		whether it was appropriate (and perhaps prudent) for PacifiCorp to enact
2		economic curtailments of usage as opposed to the alternative purchase of high
3		cost power.
4	A.	In addition to purchasing power to serve its customers' needs during the deferral
5		period (November 30, 2000 through October 31, 2001), the Company also
6		implemented Idaho Schedule 72, a load curtailment program pursuant to which
7		irrigation customers were paid to curtail their irrigation systems—either fully or
8		partially—for the entire 2001 irrigation season (June 15 to September 15, 2001).
9		In addition, the Company implemented two other load curtailment programs in
10		Idaho: the Customer Energy Challenge and the Energy Exchange Program. As a
11		result of these load curtailment programs, requirements for wholesale purchases
12		were decreased.
13	Q.	Please address the Company's position with respect to the seventh issue
14		identified: the presence of interruptible load, and the Company's treatment of the
15		same.
16	A.	Interruptibility is present in PacifiCorp's Idaho jurisdiction only with respect to
17		irrigation customers and Monsanto. The Company's treatment of Monsanto as an
18		interruptible customer is the subject of a separate proceeding (PAC-E-01-16) the
19		PacifiCorp/Monsanto Service Contract proceeding and, therefore, was not
20		discussed during the course of settlement discussions in this proceeding. The
21		Company's treatment of irrigation customers as interruptible, however, was
22		discussed extensively during the settlement discussions. As reflected in the

1		Stipulation, the Parties agreed to terminate the interruptible-options tariff in the
2		current Schedule No. 10. Instead, the Company has committed to work with the
3		IIPA and customers in the irrigation class to develop a non-tariff based
4		interruptibility option that will be offered to customers in the future. The
5		Company believes this approach to irrigation interruptibility is appropriate
6		because it will allow the interruptibility option to be more closely aligned with the
7		value of the resource acquired through interruption.
8	Q.	Please address the Company's position with respect to the eighth issue identified:
9		the Company's sales contracts executed in 2000/2001.
10	A.	No new long-term firm wholesale contracts were executed by the Company in
11		2000/2001. The Company's overall power supply strategy is discussed in detail by
12		Mr. Stan Watters in his testimony filed with the Company's Application in this
13		proceeding.
14	Q.	Please address the Company's position with respect to the ninth issue identified:
15		the timing of the loss of the Company's Hunter coal generation plant in 2000-
16		2001 and related cause(s) therefore.
17	A.	The circumstances leading up to the Hunter Unit Number 1 generator outage and
18		what PacifiCorp has been able to determine about the cause of the outage are
19		described in the testimony of Mr. Barry Cunningham, filed with the Company's
20		Application in this proceeding. While the outage of the Hunter Unit Number 1
21		generating unit from November 28, 2000 through May 8, 2001 occurred at a very
22		inopportune time with respect to purchase power prices during that time period,

1		there is no evidence to suggest that the Company's operating or maintenance
2		practices contributed to the outage.
3	Q.	Please address the Company's position with respect to the tenth issue identified:
4		the treatment of irrigators as firm, as opposed to iterruptible customers.
5	A.	As discussed above, following extensive discussion during settlement negotiation,
6		the Parties agreed to eliminate the existing interruptibilty options in Schedule No.
7		10. Further the Company agreed to work with irrigators to develop a non-tariff
8		interruptibility option for irrigators. The Company believes this approach will
9		permit a more appropriate valuation of the benefit of interruptibility.
10	Q.	Please address the Company's position with respect to the eleventh and final issue
11		identified: the treatment of special contract customers as situs customers, as
12		opposed to system customers.
13	A.	The treatment of special contract customers as situs customers as opposed to
14		system customers is the subject of a separate proceeding before this Commission
15		(Case No. PAC-E-01-16, the PacifiCorp/Monsanto Service Contract proceeding).
16		Accordingly the issue was not addressed by the parties during settlement. The
17		Company will make its recommendation to the Commission regarding that issue
18		in conjunction with Case No. PAC-E-01-16.
19	Q.	Does the Stipulation resolve all of the issues presented above?
20	A.	The parties were unable to reach specific agreement regarding some of the issues.
21		Nevertheless, the Stipulation represents an overall compromise of the Parties'
22		positions regarding all issues. The Parties agree that the Stipulation overall

1		represents a fair, just and reasonable compromise of the issues raised in this
2		proceeding and that this Stipulation is in the public interest.
3	Q.	Are there any other issues upon which you would like to comment?

Yes. I would like to add that the underlying market conditions and high purchased power prices that resulted in the Company's applications for deferral and recovery of its excess power costs are the same as those that resulted in the significant BPA credit received by Idaho customers. As such, it would be unfair for customers to enjoy the favorable BPA benefits obtained as a result of those high cost market conditions, on the one hand, and not share the burden that those conditions imposed by allowing PacifiCorp to recover in rates a portion of the excess power costs it incurred.

## Parties' Recommendation

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

A.

- Q. Why do the Parties agree that the terms of the Stipulation in this proceeding produce an overall just and reasonable outcome?
- The Parties believe that the 65% recovery of deferred excess power costs allowed 15 A. under the Stipulation represents a reasonable compromise level of excess power 16 cost recovery for the Company. In addition, the Parties believe that the modified 17 Rate Mitigation Adjustment effectively reduces the impact of the Power Cost 18 Surcharge by equitably distributing responsibility for excess power cost recovery 19 among customer classes and by limiting the change in annual revenue requirement 20 for any given class to a maximum 4% increase during the first two years the Rate 21 Mitigation Adjustment is in place. Finally, the Parties also believe that 22

1		modification of the rate structure in the irrigation class to establish a single firm
2		rate, together with PacifiCorp's commitment to developing an interruptibility
3		option for irrigators on a non-tariff basis, represent an appropriate and reasonable
4		compromise by 1) allowing the Company pricing flexibility that will better reflect
5		market conditions and 2) affording irrigators the benefit of firm service at prices
6		comparable to existing interruptible service.
7	Q.	What do the Parties recommend regarding the Stipulation?
8	A.	The Parties recommend that the Commission admit the Stipulation into the PAC-
9		E-02-1 record and adopt the Stipulation in its entirety to resolve all of the
10		outstanding issues in this proceeding.
11	Q.	Does this conclude your testimony?

12

A.

Yes.

Case No. PAC-E-02-1 Exhibit No.20 Witness: Robert C. Lively

## BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

## **PACIFICORP**

Exhibit No. 20 Accompanying Direct Testimony of Robert C. Lively

STIPULATION

April 30, 2002

John M. Eriksson STOEL RIVES LLP 201 South Main Street, Suite 1100 Salt Lake City, Utah 84111 Telephone: (801) 328-3131 Facsimile (801) 578-6999

Mary S. Hobson STOEL RIVES LLP 101 South Capitol Blvd., Suite 1800 Boise, Idaho 83702-5958 Telephone: (208) 389-9000 Facsimile (208) 389-9040

Attorneys for PacifiCorp

## BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Application of	)	CASE NO. PAC-E-02-1
PACIFICORP dba Utah Power & Light	)	
Company for Approval of Changes to Its	)	STIPULATION
Electric Service Schedules	)	

This stipulation ("Stipulation") is entered into by and among PacifiCorp, doing business as Utah Power & Light Company ("PacifiCorp" or the "Company"), the Idaho Public Utilities Commission Staff ("Staff"), the Idaho Irrigation Pumpers Association ("IIPA") and Monsanto Company ("Monsanto") (collectively referred to as the "Parties").

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. The terms and conditions of this Stipulation are set forth herein. The Parties agree that this Stipulation represents a fair, just and reasonable compromise of the issues raised in this proceeding and that this Stipulation is in the public interest. The Parties, therefore, recommend that the Public Utilities Commission ("Commission") approve the Stipulation and all of its terms and conditions. Reference IDAPA 31.01.01.272, 274.

## II. BACKGROUND

- 2. On November 1, 2000, PacifiCorp filed an Application in Case No. PAC-E-00-5 for approval to defer excess net power costs incurred from November 1, 2000 through October 31, 2001. In Commission Order No. 28630, the Commission approved the Company's request for deferred accounting of excess net power costs. Pursuant to deferral authority, the Company deferred approximately \$37 million in excess net power costs attributable to Idaho. On November 24, 2000, PacifiCorp experienced an outage at its Hunter 1 generating unit. The Hunter 1 unit became fully operational on May 8, 2001. The outage of the Hunter 1 unit increased the Company's net power costs.
- 3. On January 7, 2002, PacifiCorp filed the Application in this case seeking to recover the deferred excess net power costs, with carrying charges, amounting to approximately \$38 million over a two-year period. The Company further proposed electric service schedules that would adjust rates to bring customer classes closer to the cost of serving the respective classes and to implement an increase to the Electric Service Schedule No. 34 BPA exchange credit to reflect the increased benefit from a settlement with the Bonneville Power Administration regarding residential exchange benefits. Further, the Company proposed a Rate Mitigation Adjustment ("RMA") designed to result in no customer classes receiving an increase during the two-year period of the surcharge for the recovery of the deferred excess net power costs.
- 4. Pursuant to the Commission's Identification of Issues and Notice of Settlement Conference in this matter, the Parties have engaged in discussions with a view toward resolving PacifiCorp's Application in this case.
- 5. PacifiCorp has claimed and sought recovery of approximately \$38 million in excess net power costs, including carrying charges, incurred during the period November 1, 2000 through October 31, 2001 (the "Excess Power Costs"). The Commission Staff proposed recovery be limited to approximately \$21 million after adjustments for the Hunter 1 outage, wholesale contract costs, load growth, and jurisdictional allocation. Both IIPA and Monsanto

asserted that: 1) recovery of excess power supply costs is barred by reason of the ScottishPower - PacifiCorp Merger Approval Condition No. 2<sup>1</sup>; 2) power supply costs associated with the Hunter plant failure are not recoverable because they were incurred subsequent to the deferral Order; 3) any Hunter related costs properly deferred should be equitably shared as a result of maintenance issues; 4) costs associated with certain wholesale contracts were imprudently incurred and not recoverable; 5) thorough review and approval of the Company's cost-of-service studies was required before rates could be shifted among the customer classes. IIPA also challenged the Company's BPA credit allocation, the proposed RMA, and the elimination of irrigation A - B - C rate schedules. The Company disagreed and presented further information in response to the positions advanced by the Parties. The Company asserted that all of its Excess Power Costs were prudently incurred and are properly recoverable.

Based upon the settlement discussions among the Parties, as a compromise of the disputes in this case, and for other consideration as set forth below, the Parties agree to the following terms:

## III. TERMS OF THE STIPULATION

- 6. PacifiCorp shall be allowed to recover, through a surcharge and the acceleration of the "Merger Credit," as described below, \$ 25 million for Excess Power Costs.
- 7. As a result of the Commission's order ("Merger Order") in the ScottishPower merger case (Case No. PAC-E-99-1), customers have received since January 2000 a credit of approximately \$1.6 million per year from PacifiCorp that has been reflected as a line item on customers' bills pursuant to Electric Service Schedule No. 99 (the "Merger Credit"). If

Merger Approval Condition No. 2 provides: "At a minimum, ScottishPower shall not seek a general rate increase for its Idaho service territory effective prior to January 1, 2002." Case No. PAC-E-99-1, Order No. 28213, p. 8. With respect to that Condition, in its findings the Commission stated: "As a final and irrefutable measure to ensure that rates will not increase as a result of the merger, we hereby impose the additional condition (Merger Approval Condition No. 2) that following the merger, PacifiCorp shall not seek a general rate increase effective prior to January 1, 2002. This literally guarantees that PacifiCorp's customers will see an immediate rate reduction lasting at least two years through the combination of the merger rate credit and the moratorium on general rate increases imposed herein." Case No. PAC-E-9901, Order No. 28213, p. 31.

PacifiCorp were to continue such credit for the full four-year period reflected in the Merger Order, there would be approximately \$2.3 million, on a present value basis, remaining to be credited to customers.<sup>2</sup> The Parties agree that in order to offset PacifiCorp's Excess Power Costs, the merger credit and Electric Service Schedule No. 99 shall be accelerated and credited to reduce the Excess Power Cost recovery from \$25 million to \$22.7 million.

- 8. PacifiCorp shall be allowed to implement a power cost surcharge (the "PCS") designed to recover \$22.7 million over a 24-month period beginning May 15, 2002 and ending May 14, 2004. The PCS will be implemented as a line item charge on customers' bills through Electric Service Schedule No. 93, attached hereto as Attachment A. As reflected in Attachment A, the Parties have agreed that the PCS recovery should be tracked and that a true-up surcharge may be implemented over a 12-month period immediately following the 24-month PCS recovery period to reflect any under- or over-collection of the total authorized PCS amount.
- 9. The Parties agree that the revenue obligations of the various customer classes shall be spread among the classes in the manner described in Attachment B. The Parties further agree that Electric Service Schedule No. 10 shall be redesigned in accordance with Attachment C. In response to concerns from the IIPA concerning the loss of the Schedule 10, Irrigation Season Rate C and its associated load control benefits, PacifiCorp agrees that it is willing to discuss individual interruptibility or load control contracts for the 2002 irrigation season with not more than 15 large irrigators<sup>3</sup> on a first come first served basis upon individual request of a member of said class of irrigators for such discussion. PacifiCorp also agrees that it will work with the IIPA and the irrigators as a class to develop an optional load control program for the 2003 irrigation season and thereafter that would allow an irrigator to participate in such program

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Under the terms of the Merger Order, PacifiCorp can avoid the \$1.6 million dollar credit during the last two years, i.e., 2002 through 2003, to the extent that cost reductions related to the merger are reflected in rates.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> For purposes of paragraph 9 of this Stipulation, "large irrigators" are defined as irrigators having an individual meter registering greater than 500 kW demand during the last 12 months.

on an annual basis. PacifiCorp shall file its proposed optional load control program with the Commission no later than January 31, 2003.

The Parties also agree that the RMA will be implemented as a line item charge on customers' bills through Electric Service Schedule No. 94, attached hereto as Attachment D. The Parties further agree that upon the earlier of (1) the expiration of the current Electric Service Schedule No. 34 BPA exchange credit or (2) the adoption by the Commission of a cost of service study for PacifiCorp and the subsequent implementation for all customers of said approved cost of service study by any lawful method by the Commission or PacifiCorp, Electric Service Schedule No. 94 will be terminated.

- 10. The Parties agree that this Stipulation represents a compromise of the positions of the Parties in this case. Other than the above referenced positions and any testimony filed in support of the approval of this Stipulation, and except to the extent necessary for a Party to explain before the Commission its own statements and positions with respect to the Stipulation, all negotiations relating to this Stipulation shall be treated as confidential.
- 11. The Parties submit this Stipulation to the Commission and recommend approval in its entirety pursuant to IDAPA 31.01.01.274. Parties shall support this Stipulation before the Commission, and no Party shall appeal any portion of this Stipulation or Order approving the same. If this Stipulation is challenged by any person not a party to the Stipulation, the Parties to this Stipulation reserve the right to cross-examine witnesses and put on such case as they deem appropriate to respond fully to the issues presented, including the right to raise issues that are incorporated in the settlements embodied in this Stipulation. Notwithstanding this reservation of rights, the Parties to this Stipulation agree that they will continue to support the Commission's adoption of the terms of this Stipulation.

- 12. In the event the Commission rejects any part or all of this Stipulation, or imposes any additional material conditions on approval of this Stipulation, each Party reserves the right, upon written notice to the Commission and the other Parties to this proceeding, within 15 days of the date of such action by the Commission, to withdraw from this Stipulation. In such case, no Party shall be bound or prejudiced by the terms of this Stipulation, and each Party shall be entitled to seek reconsideration of the Commission's order, file testimony as it chooses, crossexamine witnesses, and do all other things necessary to put on such case as it deems appropriate.
- 13. The Parties agree that this Stipulation is in the public interest and that all of its terms and conditions are fair, just and reasonable.
- 14. No Party shall be bound, benefited or prejudiced by any position asserted in the negotiation of this Stipulation, except to the extent expressly stated herein, nor shall this Stipulation be construed as a waiver of the rights of any Party unless such rights are expressly waived herein. Execution of this Stipulation shall not be deemed to constitute an acknowledgment by any Party of the validity or invalidity of any particular method, theory or principle of regulation or cost recovery, and no Party shall be deemed to have agreed that any method, theory or principle of regulation or cost recovery employed in arriving at this Stipulation is appropriate for resolving any issues in any other proceeding in the future. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, nothing in this Stipulation, and nothing asserted in the negotiation of this Stipulation, shall be the basis of waiver or estoppel in Case No. PAC-E-01-16 (Monsanto). No findings of fact or conclusions of law other than those stated herein shall be deemed to be implicit in this Stipulation.

15. The obligations of the Parties under this Stipulation are subject to the Commission's approval of this Stipulation in accordance with its terms and conditions and upon such approval being upheld on appeal by a court of competent jurisdiction.

Respectfully submitted this 1040 day of April, 2002.

**PacifiCorp** Idaho Public Utilities Commission Staff Scott D. Woodbury, its attorney of record Idaho Irrigation Pumpers Association Eric L. Olsen, its attorney of record Monsanto Company By\_\_\_\_\_\_Randall C. Budge, its attorney of record 15. The obligations of the Parties under this Stipulation are subject to the Commission's approval of this Stipulation in accordance with its terms and conditions and upon such approval being upheld on appeal by a court of competent jurisdiction.

Respectfully submitted this  $10^{1/4}$  day of April, 2002.

PacifiCorp
ByErinn Kelley-Siel, its attorney of record
Idaho Public Utilities Commission Staff
Scott D. Woodbury, its attorney of record 4/09/02
Idaho Irrigation Pumpers Association
ByEric L. Olsen, its attorney of record
Monsanto Company
ByRandall C. Budge, its attorney of record

The obligations of the Parties under this Stipulation are subject to the Commission's approval of this Stipulation in accordance with its terms and conditions and upon such approval being upheld on appeal by a court of competent jurisdiction.

Respectfully submitted this 10th day of April, 2002.

PacifiCorp
By Erinn Kelley-Siel, its attorney of record
Idaho Public Utilities Commission Staff
ByScott D. Woodbury, its attorney of record

Idaho Irrigation Pumpers Association

Eric L. Olsen, its attorney of record

Monsanto Company

By | audul L' | Bully 4-8-

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 10th day of April, 2002, a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served on the following via U.S. mail:

Scott Woodbury Deputy Attorney General Idaho Public Utilities Commission P.O. Box 83720 Boise, ID 83720-0074

Eric Olsen Racine, Olson, Nye, Budge & Bailey P.O. Box 1391 201 E. Center Pocatello, ID 83204-1391

Anthony J. Yankel 29814 Lake Road Bay Village, OH 44140

Randall C. Budge Racine, Olson, Nye, Budge & Bailey P.O. Box 1391 201 E. Center Pocatello, ID 83204-1391

James R. Smith Senior Accounting Specialist Monsanto Company P.O. Box 816 Soda Springs, ID 83276

Mr. Tim Shurtz 411 South Main Firth, Idaho 83236



I.P.U.C. No. 28

Original Sheet No. 93

## **UTAH POWER & LIGHT COMPANY**

## ELECTRIC SERVICE SCHEDULE NO. 93

## STATE OF IDAHO

## POWER COST SURCHARGE

AVAILABILITY: At any point on the Company's interconnected system.

**APPLICATION**: This Schedule shall be applicable to all retail tariff Customers (including Schedule 400 – Nu-West Industries Inc.) taking service under the terms contained in this Tariff.

MONTHLY BILL: In addition to the Monthly Charges contained in the Customer's applicable schedule, all monthly bills shall have applied an amount equal to the product of all metered kilowatt-hours multiplied by the following cents per kilowatt-hour as determined by the Voltage Level at which the Customer takes service. The charges in the column labeled "Year 1" shall be in effect for one year beginning on the effective date of this tariff. The charges in the column labeled "Year 2" shall be in effect for one year beginning at the end of Year 1. The Company shall track the total amount collected through Year 1 and Year 2 and true up in Year 3. In Year 3, this surcharge may continue at a revised rate, subject to subsequent Commission review and approval, in order to reflect any undercollection or overcollection of the total authorized surcharge amount.

Voltage Level	Year 1	Year 2
Secondary - less than 2,300 volts	0.8585 ¢	0.4200¢
Primary - 2,300 to 44,000 volts	0.8326¢	0.4073 ¢
Transmission - over 44,000 volts	0.8151¢	0.3988¢

Table B1

# UTAH POWER ESTIMATED EFFECT OF PROPOSED PRICES ON REVENUES FROM ELECTRIC SALES TO ULTIMATE CONSUMERS DISTRIBUTED BY RATE SCHEDULES IN IDAHO NORMALIZED 12 MONTHS ENDED MARCH 2001

Particion   Part		21	20	15 16 17 18	7	13	12	=	10	9	000	7	6	5	4		ديا	2				Linc	
Average   Aver					444											442			440	3	No.	Account	
th. No. Customers (NATION) No. Customers (N		Total Sales to Ultimate Consumer	Total Public Street Lighting	Security Area Lighting Security Area Lighting (R&F) Street Lighting - Company Street Lighting - Customer Traffic Signal Systems	Total Commercial & Industrial Public Street Lighting	Special Contracts - Nu West	General Service Optional TOD	General Service (R&F)	General Service	Comm. & Ind. Space Heating		General Service - High Voltage	General Service - Med. Voltage	General Svc Lg. Power (R&F)	General Service - Large Power	Commercial & Industrial	Total Residential	Residential Service Residential Optional TOD	Residential Sales	(2)	Description		
		si		7 7A 11 12 12			35	23A	23	19	10	9	œ	6A	6			1 36				Sch.	
Carrent Revenues (2010)		54,386	637	245 181 29 161 21	9,292			1,310	4,591	346	1,876	14	4	222	927		44,457	28,524 15,933		(4)	Customers	No. of	Avargos
Carriart Revenue (Stite)		1,788,373	2,709	288 141 137 1,919 224	1,224,256	114,868	1,227	16,388	85,932	13,338	615,632	104,022	2,816	28,149	241,884		561,408	257,880 303,528		(5)	MWh		
Net		\$108,924	\$425	\$72 \$38 \$41 \$251 \$23	\$66,060	\$4,000	\$52	\$1,468	\$7,410	\$942	\$32,327	\$4,373	\$156	\$1,761	\$13,571		\$42,439	\$22,056 \$20,383		(6)	Rev.		2
Net		(\$1,785)	(\$7)	(\$1) (\$1) (\$1) (\$4) \$0	(\$1,056)		(\$1)	(\$25)	(\$126)	(\$16)	(\$550)	(\$74)	(\$3)	(\$30)	(\$231)		(\$722)	(\$375) (\$347)		Э	Credit	Merger	D
Proposed Yr1			(\$1)	(\$1)	(\$5,724)			(\$53)			(\$5,578)			(\$93)			(\$1,990)	(\$951) (\$1,039)		(8)	Credit	Sch. 34	
Proposed Yr1   Proposed   Propo		\$99,424	\$417	\$71 \$36 \$40 \$247 \$23	\$59,280	\$4,000	\$51	\$1,390	\$7,284	\$926	\$26,199	\$4,299	\$153	\$1,638	\$13,340		\$39,727	\$20,730 \$18,997	3	(6)+(7)+(8)	Rev.	Net	
Proposed Yr1		\$0	(\$19)	(\$2) \$0 (\$14) (\$2)	\$19	(\$777)	(\$10)	\$0	(\$570)	(\$94)	\$4,000	(\$750)	(\$21)	\$0	(\$1,759)		\$0	\$0		(10)	(\$000)	Rev.	
PCS         Total C. (S000)         Exclusive of Sch. 34         Proposed Sch. 34         Total Conference of Sch. 34         Total Change (S000)         Inclusive of Sch. 34         Total Total Total Change (S000)         Inclusive of Sch. 34         Total Total Total Total Total Total Total Total (S000)         Inclusive of Sch. 34         Total (S000)         Inclusive of Sch. 34         Total				-0.6944 0.0000 -0.7299 -0.7295 -0.8929		-0.6764	-0.8150	0.0000	-0.6633	-0.7048	0.6497	-0.7210	-0.7457	0.0000	-0.7272			0.0000	(softer)	(11)	¢/kWh	ľ	
Total   Royal   Roya		\$15,251	\$24	\$3 \$1 \$17 \$2	:			\$141	\$737	\$115	\$5,285	\$848	\$24	\$242	\$2,068			\$2,214 \$2,606		(12)	(\$000)	Rev	
Change	_	14.00%	5.65%	4.17% 2.63% 2.44% 6.77% 8.70%	15.75%	23.40%	21.15%	9.60%	9.95%	12.21%	16.35%	19.39%	15.38%	13.74%	15.24%		11.36%	10.04% 12.79%	(0)(41)	(13)	%		
Proposed   Inclusive of Sch. 34   Total   Rev.   Credit   (S000)   % (20)   (17)   (18)   (18)   (19)   (		\$124,175	\$430	\$73 \$39 \$41 \$254 \$23	\$76,486	\$4,159	\$53	\$1,609	\$7.577	\$963	\$41,612	\$4,471	\$159	\$2,003	\$13,880		\$47,259	\$24,270 \$22,989	(41), (41), (6)	(14)	_	_	
Proposed   Inclusive of Sch. 34   Total   Rev.   Credit   (S000)   % (20)   (17)   (18)   (18)   (19)   (		\$17,036	\$12	\$2 \$2 \$1 \$7	\$11,482	\$159	\$2	\$166	\$293	\$37	\$9,835	\$172	\$6	\$272	\$540		\$5,542	\$2,589 \$2,953	(1)/(0)/(1)	(15)	(\$000)		Exclusive of S
Proposed   Inclusive of Sch. 34   Total   Rev.   Credit   (S000)   % (20)   (17)   (18)   (18)   (19)   (		15.9%	2.9%	2.8% 5.4% 2.5% 2.8% 0.0%	17.7%	4.0%	3.9%	11.5%	4 0%	4 0%	31.0%	4.0%	3.9%	15.7%	4.0%		13.3%	11.9% 14.7%	2)/ {(0)-(1)}	(16)	%	hanna	ch. 34
Inclusive of Sch. 34   Total   Rev.   Change (St00)   (\$1000)   %   (21)   (22)   (18)((6)+(7))   (14)+(18)   (20)+(9)   (21)((9)+(18)((6)+(7))   (14)+(18)   (20)+(9)   (21)((9)+(18)((6)+(7))   (14)+(18)   (20)+(9)   (21)((9)+(18)((6)+(7))   (21)((14)+(18)   (21)((14)+(18)(		0.953	0.443	0.694 1.418 0.730 0.365 0.000	0.938	0.138	0.163	1.013	0.241	0 277	1.598	0.165	0.213	0.966	0.223		0.987	1.004 0.973	(c)/(c1)	(17)			
Total   Change   Rev.   (\$500)   Change   (\$900)   (\$21)   (22)   (\$919)   (14)+(18)   (\$55.079)   -24.5%   (\$25.078)   (\$25		(\$40,569)	(\$5)	\$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$	(\$21,813)	\$0	\$0	(\$540)	\$ 6	<b>?</b>	(\$20,344)	S OS	So	(\$929)	SO.		(\$18,751)	(\$8,619) (\$10,132)	_		(\$000)	Sch.	Propo
Inclusive of Sch. 34   Change   (\$500)   % (\$21)   (21)(9)   (22)(20)(9)   (22)(9)   (25)(12)(9)   (25)(12)(9)   (25)(12)(9)   (25)(12)(9)   (25)(12)(9)   (25)(12)(9)   (25)(12)(9)   (25)(12)(9)   (25)(12)(9)   (25)(12)(12)(12)(12)(12)(12)(12)(12)(12)(12		-37.87%	-1.20%	0.00% -13.51% 0.00% 0.00%	-33.56%	0.00%	0.00%	-37 42%	0.00%	7000	-64.02%	0.00%	0.00%	-53.67%	0.00%		-44.95%	-39.75% -50.57%	18)/{(0)+(7)}	(19)	%	34	sed
15ch.34 Change % (21)(9) -24.5% -32.3% -28.2% 4.0% 4.0% 4.0% 4.0% 4.0% 4.0% 4.0% 4.0			\$425	\$73 \$34 \$41 \$254 \$23	\$54,673	\$4,159	\$53	\$1,060	\$7577	2063	\$21,268	\$4.471	\$150	\$1.074	\$13.880		\$28,508	\$15,651 \$12,857	(14)+(18)	(20)	(\$000)	Total	
110, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0	***************************************	(\$15,818)	88	\$2 \$1 \$0	(\$4,607)	\$159	\$2	(1023)	5303	3	(\$4,931)	\$172	(200)	(\$564)	\$540		(\$11,219)	(\$5,079) (\$6,140)		- 1	_		Inclusive of
### #### #############################		-15.9%	1.9%	2.8% -5.6% 2.5% 2.8% 0.0%	-7.8%	4.0%	3.9%	-23 1%	4.0%	1000	-18.8%	4.0%	3 00%	-34.4%	4 0%		-28.2%	-24.5% -32.3%	(21)/(9)	(22)	Change %		Sch. 34
		(0.884)	0.295	0.694 -1.418 0.730 0.365 0.000	-0.376	0.138	0.163	1 050	0.2//	3	-0.801	0165	0.00	2 004	0 223		-1.998	-1.970 -2.023	(21)/(5)	(23)	¢/kWh		

Attachement B

## Table B2

# UTAH POWER ESTIMATED EFFECT OF PROPOSED PRICES ON REVENUES FROM ELECTRIC SALES TO ULTIMATE CONSUMERS DISTRIBUTED BY RATE SCHEDULES IN IDAHO NORMALIZED 12 MONTHS ENDED MARCH 2001

21	20	15 16 17 18	14	10 11 12 13	4001	w	2	Line Ac
Total Sales to Ultimate Consumers	Total Public Street Lighting	Security Area Lighting Security Area Lighting (R&F) Street Lighting - Company Street Lighting - Customer Traffic Signal Systems	Total Commercial & Industrial  444 Public Street Lighting	Comm. & Ind. Space Heating General Service (R&F) General Service (P&F) General Service Optional TOD Special Contracts - Nu West	General Service - Large Power General Svez - Lg. Power (R&F) 6A General Svez - Med. Vollage 8 General Service - High Vollage 9 Infigation Rate Total Customers:	Total Residential  442 Commercial & Industrial	Residential Service Residential Optional TOD	Account     Description
5.		7 7A 111 12				4	1 21 36 1:	Sch. Av
54,386 1	637	245 181 29 161 21	9,292	346 4,591 1,310 1	927 222 4 4 14 1,876 4,670	44,457	28,524 15,933	Average No. of Customers (4)
1,788.373	2,709	288 141 137 1,919 224	1,224,256	13,338 85,932 16,388 1,227 114,868	241,884 28,149 2,816 104,022 615,632	561,408	257,880 303,528	MWh (5)
\$108,924	\$425	\$72 \$38 \$41 \$251 \$23	\$66,060	\$942 \$7,410 \$1,468 \$52 \$4,000	\$13,571 \$1,761 \$156 \$4,373 \$32,327	\$42,439	\$22,056 \$20,383	Base Current Rev.
\$15,251	SS	\$1 \$3 \$0	\$10,426	\$21 \$167 \$141 \$1 \$159	\$309 \$242 \$3 \$3 \$98 \$9,285	\$4,820	\$2,214 \$2,606	Yr 1 RMA + PCS (7)
(\$40,569)	(\$5)	\$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$	(\$21,813)	\$0 \$0 (\$540) \$0 \$0	\$0 (\$929) \$0 \$0 (\$20,344)	(\$18,751)	(\$8,619) (\$10,132)	End of Yr 1 (8000) Yr 1 Yr 1 RMA + Sch. 34 PCS Credit (7) (8)
\$83,606	\$425	\$73 \$34 \$41 \$425 \$254	\$54,673	\$963 \$7,577 \$1,069 \$53 \$4,159	\$13,880 \$1,074 \$159 \$4,471 \$21,268	\$28,508	\$15,651 \$12,857	Net Rev. (9) (6)+(7)+(8)
\$0	(\$9)	\$ (\$ (\$ (\$ (\$ (\$ (\$ (\$ (\$ (\$ (\$ (\$ (\$ (\$	\$2,268	(\$35) (\$194) (\$64) (\$4) (\$299)	(\$702) (\$110) (\$9) (\$315) \$4,000	(\$2,259)	(\$1,039) (\$1,220)	RMA Rev. (\$000) ¢
***************************************		0.0000 -0.7092 -0.7299 -0.3127 -0.4464		-0.2624 -0.2258 -0.3905 -0.3260 -0.2603	-0.2902 -0.3908 -0.3196 -0.3028 -0.6497		-0.4029 -0.4019	Proposed Yr 2 A Rec  ¢/kWh (\$00 (10)/(5)
\$7,461	\$12	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	\$5,091	\$56 \$361 \$69 \$5 \$458	\$1,011 \$118 \$12 \$415 \$2,586	\$2,358	\$1,083 \$1,275	PCS Rev. (\$000)
6.85%	2.82%	1.39% 2.63% 2.44% 3.19% 4.35%	7.71%	5.94% 4.87% 4.70% 9.62% 11.45%	7.45% 6.70% 7.69% 9.49% 8.00%	5.56%	4.91% 6.26%	% (13) (12)/(6)
\$116,385	\$428	\$73 \$38 \$41 \$253 \$23	\$73,419	\$963 \$7,577 \$1,473 \$53 \$4,159	\$13,880 \$1,769 \$159 \$4,473 \$38,913	\$42,538	\$22,100 \$20,438	Total Rev. (\$000) (14) (6)+(10)+(12)
(\$7,790)	(\$2)	\$0 \$0 \$0 \$0	(\$3,067)	\$0 \$0 (\$136) \$0 \$0	\$0 (\$234) \$0 \$2 (\$2,699)	(\$4,721)	(\$2,170) (\$2,551)	Exclusive of Sch.  Chi (\$000) (15) (14)-(6)-(7) (15)(
-6.3%	-0.5%	0.0% -2.6% 0.0% -0.4% 0.0%	-4.0%	0.0% 0.0% -8.5% 0.0% 0.0%	0.0% -11.7% 0.0% 0.0% -6.5%	-10.0%	-8.9% -11.1%	Change (16) (15){(6)+(7)}
(0.436)	-0.074	0.000 -0.709 0.000 -0.052 0.000	-0.251	0.000 0.000 -0.830 0.000	0.000 -0.831 0.000 0.002 -0.438	-0.841	-0.841 -0.840	6/kWh (17) (15)(5)
(\$35,191)	(\$4)	\$0 \$0 \$0 \$0	(\$21,157)	\$0 \$0 (\$404) \$0 \$0	\$0 (\$695) \$0 \$0 \$0 (\$20,058)	(\$14,030)	(\$6,449) (\$7,581)	Proposed Yr2 Sch. 34 Credit (\$000) % (18) (19)(6)
-28,34%	-0.93%	0.00% -10.26% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00%	-27.66%	0.00% 0.00% -25.11% 0.00% 0.00%	0.00% -34.70% 0.00% 0.00% 48.20%	-29.69%	-26.57% -32.98%	.34 .96 (19) (18)/((6)+(7)}
\$81,194	\$424	\$73 \$34 \$41 \$253 \$23	\$52,262	\$963 \$7,577 \$1,069 \$53 \$4,159	\$13,880 \$1,074 \$159 \$4,473 \$18,855	\$28,508	\$15,651 \$12,857	Total Rev. (\$000) (14)+(18)
(\$2,412)	(\$1)	\$(\$1) \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0	(\$2,411)	00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	\$0 \$0 \$0 \$2 (\$2,413)	\$0	\$0 80	Inclusive of Sch. 34  Change (3000) % (21) (22) (20)-(9) (21)(9)
-2.9%	-0.2%	0.0% 0.0% 0.0% -0.4% 0.0%	-4.4%	0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0% 0.0% -11.3%	0.0%	0.0%	Change % (21)/(9)
(0.135)	-0.037	0.000 0.000 0.000 -0.052 0.000	-0.197	0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000	0.000 0.000 0.000 0.002 -0.392	0.000	0.000	¢/kWh (23) (21)/(5)
(\$18,230)	\$7	\$2 (\$2) \$6 \$0	(\$7,018)	\$37 \$293 (\$321) \$2 \$159	\$540 (\$564) \$6 \$174 (\$7,344)	(\$11,219)	(\$5,079) (\$6,140)	Total Change From Current (\$000) % (24) (25) (24) (45)
-18.3%	1.7%	2.8% -5.6% 2.5% 2.4% 0.0%	-11.8%	4.0% 4.0% -23.1% 3.9% 4.0%	4.0% -34.4% 3.9% 4.0% -28.0%	-28.2%	-24,5% -32.3%	Change Current  9/6 (25) (24)/((A1(9))

## Table B3

# UTAH POWER ESTIMATED EFFECT OF PROPOSED PRICES ON REVENUES FROM ELECTRIC SALES TO ULTIMATE CONSUMERS DISTRIBUTED BY RATE SCHEDULES IN IDAHO NORMALIZED 12 MONTHS ENDED MARCH 2001

1	21 6	3 5	5 5	17	16	15		74	: :3	12	=	10	9		œ	7	6	S	4		u	,	د			140.			
							44													442				46	ξ		Account		
TOTAL CARGO TO CALLINATE COMBUIRD	Total Sales to Ultimate Consumers	Traine organic systems	Street Lighting - Customer	Street Lighting - Company	Security Area Lighting (R&F)	Security Area Lighting	Public Street Lighting	Total Commercial & Industrial	Special Contracts - Nu West		General Service (R&F) 23A	General Service	Corum, & Ind. Space Heating		Irrigation Rate	General Service - High Voltage	General Service - Med. Voltage	General Svc Lg. Power (R&F)	General Service - Large Power	Commercial & Industrial	Total Residential	Residential Optional LOD	Residential Service	Residential Sales	(2)	(2)	Description		
			3 12	=	7A	7		ı		35	23A	23	19	omers:	ő	9	∞	6A	6		,		<b>x</b> –		(2)	٠.	S 59		
, T. J. GO	54 386	1	3 61	29	181	245		9,292	,	-	1,310	4,591	346	4,670	1,876	14	4	222	927		44,457	10,700	28,524		3	(A)	No. of	Average	
1,700,575	1.788.171	1	1,919	137	141	288		1,224,256	114,868	1,227	16,388	85,932	13,338		615,632	104,022	2,816	28,149	241,884		561,408	202,550	257,880		(3)	in the	AWA.		
9100,724	\$108.924	\$23	\$251	\$41	\$38	\$72		\$66,060	\$4,000	\$52	\$1,468	\$7,410	\$942		\$32,327	\$4,373	\$156	\$1,761	\$13,571		\$42,439	\$20,505	\$22,056		(8)	100	Current	Base	
37,701	\$7.461	5 8	s \$2	\$0	0.8	\$1		\$7,359	\$159	\$1	\$5	\$167	\$21		\$6,586	\$100	\$3 53	\$8	\$309		\$99	900	\$44 \$44		(3)	100	KMA +	Yr 2	End of Yr 2 (S000)
1000100	(\$15 191)	90	80	\$0	(\$4)	\$0		(\$21,157)	\$0	\$0	(\$404)	\$0	\$0		(\$20,058)	\$0	\$0	(\$695)	\$0		(\$14,030)	(\$7,501)	(\$6,449)		(6)	Cicuit	Sch. 34	Yr 2	r 2 (S000)
301,174	\$81 194	24.5	\$253	\$41	\$34	\$73		\$52,262	\$4,159	\$53	\$1,069	\$7,577	\$963		\$18.855	\$4,473	\$159	\$1,074	\$13,880		\$28,508	\$12,037	\$15,651		(6)+(7)+(8)	(O)	No.	!	
90	(2116)	(30)	(\$67)	(\$11)	(\$9)	(\$19)		\$2,642	\$0	\$0	(\$173)	(\$1,106)	(\$86)	,	\$4,000	\$0	\$7	\$0	\$0		(\$2,530)	(3/32)			(10)	(0000)	Kev.	RMA	
Se Management		-2.07.80	-3.4914	-8.0292	-6.3830	-6.5972			0.0000	0.0000	-1.0557	-1.2871	-0.6448		0.6497	0.0000	0.2486	0.0000	0.0000			-0.2412	-0.6972		(10)/(5)	1			Proposed Yr 3
30		i	0.0					\$0		\$0					08						SO	30			(12)	1		PCS	r 3
0.90%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0,00%	0.00%		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		(12)/(6)		•		
\$100,924	\$108 074	317	\$184	\$30	\$29	\$53	•	\$68,702	\$4,000	\$52	\$1,295	\$6,304	\$856	-	\$36.327	\$4.373	\$163	\$1,761	\$13,571		\$39,909	319,631	\$20,258		(6)+(10)+(12)	(3000)	Kev.	Total	
(3/,401)	(\$7.461)	(36)	(\$69)	(\$11)	(\$9)	(\$20)		(\$4,717)	(\$159)	(S)	(\$178)	(\$1.273)	(\$107)		(\$2.586)	(\$100)	2	(\$8)	(\$309)		(\$2,629)	(3/8/)	(\$1,842)		(14)-(6)-(7) (1	(3000)			Exclusive of Sch. 34
-0.4%	-20.9%	-20.1%	-27.3%	-26.8%	-23.7%	-27.4%		-6.4%	-3.8%	-1.9%	-12.1%	-16.8%	-11.1%		-6.6%	-2.2%	2.5%	-0.5%	-2.2%		-6.2%	-3.9%	-8.3%		3	70			ch. 34
(0.41/)	4.245	-2.6/9	-3.596	-8.029	-6.383	-6.944		-0.385	-0.138	-0.081	-1.086	-1.481	-0.802		-0.420	-0.096	0.142	-0.028	-0.128		-0.468	-0.259	-0.714		(15)(5)	UM N/3	ANA		
(35),191)	(\$35 101)	8	s S	\$0	(\$4)	\$0		(\$21,157)	\$0	\$0	(\$404)	So	08	(many trans	(\$20.058)	so os	So.	(\$695)	SO OS		(\$14,030)	(\$7,581)	(\$6,449)		(81)	(3000)	Credit	Sch. 34	Propos
-30.24%	-0.93%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	-10.53%	0.00%		-28.82%	0.00%	0.00%	-27.43%	0.00%	0.00%		-51.55%	0.00%	0.00%	-39 29%	0.00%		-32.98%	-37.09%	-29.18%		(18)/(6)+(7)}	%		34	ed Yr3
\$/3,/33	\$309	\$17	\$184	\$30	\$25	\$53		\$47,545	\$4,000	\$52	\$891	\$6.304	\$856	4.0	\$16,269	\$4 373	\$163	\$1.066	\$13.571		\$25,879	\$12,070	\$13,809		(14)+(18)	(3000)	Rev.	Total	
(3/,401)	(\$115)	(\$6)	(\$69)	(\$11)	(\$9)	(\$20)		(\$4,717)	(\$159)	(\$1)	(\$178)	(\$1.273)	(\$107)	(anima)	(\$2.58)	(0013)	2 (	(\$8)	(\$309)		(\$2,629)	(\$787)	(\$1,842)		(20)-(9)	(3000)			Inclusive of Sch. 34
-9.2%	-27.1%	-26.1%	-27.3%	-26.8%	-26.5%	-27.4%		-9.0%	-3.8%	-1.9%	-16.7%	-16.8%	-1:		13 70%	2000	2 5%	-0.7%	-2.2%		-9.2%	-6.1%	-11.8%		(21)(9)	%	Change		Sch. 34
(0.417)	4.245	-2.679	-3.596	-8.029	-6.383	-6.944		-0.385	-0.138	-0.081	-1.086	-1 481	-0.802	0.44	0.000	2000	0143	-0.028	-0.128		-0.468	-0.259	-0.714		21 (23)	c/kWh			
(\$25,691)		(\$6)	(\$63)	(\$10)	(\$11)	(\$18)		(\$11,735)	\$0	SI	(\$499)	(\$980)	(\$70)	(000,00)	(\$0.020)	\$74	\$10	(\$572)	\$231		(\$13,848)	(\$6,927)	(\$6,921)	1	(24) (20)-(A[(9))	(3000)		From Current	Total Ch
-25.8%	-25.9%	-26.1%	-25.5%	-25.0%	-30.6%	-25.4%		-19.8%	0.0%	2.0%	740 51	13.5%	-7 6%	976.75	37 00/	1 70%	202.20	34 0%	1.7%		-34.9%	-36.5%	-33.4%	1	(25)	%		urrent	ange



I.P.U.C. No. 28

Fifth Revised Sheet No. 10.1 Canceling Fourth Revised Sheet No. 10.1

## **UTAH POWER & LIGHT COMPANY**

## **ELECTRIC SERVICE SCHEDULE NO. 10**

## STATE OF IDAHO

## Irrigation and Soil Drainage Pumping Power Service

**AVAILABILITY**: At any point on the Company's interconnected system where there are facilities of adequate capacity.

**APPLICATION:** This Schedule is for alternating current, single or three-phase electric service supplied at the Company's available voltage through a single point of delivery for service to motors on pumps and machinery used for irrigation and soil drainage.

IRRIGATION SEASON AND POST-SEASON SERVICE: The Irrigation Season is from June 1 to September 15 each year. Service for post-season pumping may be taken by the same Customer at the same point of delivery and through the same facilities used for supplying regular irrigation pumping service during months from September 16 to the following May 31.

## MONTHLY BILL:

## Irrigation Season Rate

Customer Service Charge:

Small Pumping Operations:

15 horsepower or less total connected horsepower served through one service connection -

\$10.17 per Customer

(C)

(N)

(N)

Large Pumping Operations:

16 horsepower or more total connected horsepower served through one service connection -

\$30.33 per Customer

(Continued)

Submitted Under Case No. PAC-E-02-1

ISSUED: April 10, 2002 EFFECTIVE: May 15, 2002



I.P.U.C. No. 28

Fifth Revised Sheet No. 10.2 Canceling Fourth Revised Sheet No. 10.2

## **ELECTRIC SERVICE SCHEDULE No. 10 - Continued**

MONTHLY BILL: (Continued) (N) \$4.05 per kW for all kW Power Rate: 5.4320¢ per kWh for first 25,000 kWh **Energy Rate:** 3.8024¢ per kWh for the next 225,000 kWh 2.5000¢ per kWh for all additional kWh Power Factor: This rate is based on the Customer maintaining at all times a power factor of 85% lagging, or higher, as determined by measurement. If the average power factor is found to be less than 85% lagging, the power as recorded by the Company's meter will be increased by 3/4 of 1% for every 1% that the power factor is less than 85%. The Customer Service Charge. Minimum: Post-Season Rate (C) \$16.17 per Customer **Customer Service Charge:** 4.5059¢ per kWh for all kWh **Energy Rate:** (I) The Customer Service Charge. Minimum: (N) ADJUSTMENTS: All monthly bills shall be adjusted in accordance with Schedules 34, 93 and 94. (C) PAYMENT: All monthly service billings will be due and payable when rendered and will be considered delinquent if not paid within fifteen (15) days. An advance payment may be required of the Customer by the Company in accordance with Electric Service Regulation No. 9. An advance may be required under any of the following conditions: the Customer failed to pay all amounts owed to the Company when due and (1) payable; the Customer paid an advance the previous season that did not adequately cover (2)

Submitted Under Case No. PAC-E-02-1

ISSUED: April 10, 2002 EFFECTIVE: May 15, 2002

(Continued)

due date of the final billing issued for the season.

bills for the entire season and the Customer failed to pay any balance owing by the



Fifth Revised Sheet No. 10.3 Canceling Fourth Revised Sheet No. 10.3

I.P.U.C. No. 28

## **ELECTRIC SERVICE SCHEDULE No. 10 - Continued**

PAYMENT: (continued)

An adequate assurance of payment (advance) may be required from a Customer who has filed bankruptcy. Advances which may be required of the Customer may be paid with cash payment or guarantee, as required by the Company, or with a letter of escrow acceptable to the Company from an authorized bank in the Company's service area. This letter of escrow shall provide that upon termination of service to the Customer, the Company shall receive, upon demand, cash equal to the unpaid balance of the Customer's bill which is not disputed or the full amount of the advance, whichever is the lesser amount.

CONNECTION AND DISCONNECTION CHARGES: Company will not routinely seasonally connect and disconnect service to irrigation pumps. However, upon oral or written request the Company will connect and disconnect service at the beginning and end of Customer's pumping operation each year without charge. Customer shall give Company at least two (2) weeks advance notice of the date disconnection and connection of seasonal service is desired. The actual expense incurred for additional connection and disconnection shall be paid by Customer. Customer shall give Company at least two (2) weeks advance notice of the date any additional connection and/or an additional disconnection of service is desired. Meters will not be read and bills will not be issued from November 1 to March 1 unless the customer requests in writing a different ending or beginning point for billing. The bill issued in March will include charges for any unbilled energy used during the period of November 1 to March 1.

POWER: The kW as shown by or computed from the readings of the Company's power meter for the 15-minute period of Customer's greatest use during the month, adjusted for power factor as specified, determined to the nearest kW. Metered power demands in kilowatts which exceed one hundred and thirty percent (130%) of the total connected horsepower served through one service connection will not be used for billing purposes unless and until verified by field test in the presence of the Company to be the result of normal pumping operations. If a demand in excess of 130% of connected horsepower is the result of abnormal conditions existing on the Company's interconnected system or the Customer's system, including accidental equipment failure or electrical supply interruption which results in temporary separation of the Company and Customer's system, the billing demand shall be 130% of the connected horsepower. The Customer may appeal the Company's billing decision to the Idaho Public Utilities Commission in cases of dispute.

CONTRACT PERIOD: One year or longer.

(Continued)

Submitted Under Case No. PAC-E-02-1

ISSUED: April 10, 2002 EFFECTIVE: May 15, 2002

(C)



I.P.U.C. No. 28

Fifth Revised Sheet No. 10.4 Canceling Fourth Revised Sheet No. 10.4

## **ELECTRIC SERVICE SCHEDULE No. 10 - Continued**

**ELECTRIC SERVICE REGULATIONS**: Service under this Schedule will be in accordance with the terms of the Electric Service Agreement between the Customer and the Company. The Electric Service Regulations of the Company on file with and approved by the Idaho Public Utilities Commission, including future applicable amendments, will be considered as forming a part of and incorporated in said Agreement.

I.P.U.C. No. 28

Original Sheet No. 94

## **UTAH POWER & LIGHT COMPANY**

## ELECTRIC SERVICE SCHEDULE NO. 94

### STATE OF IDAHO

### RATE MITIGATION ADJUSTMENT

AVAILABILITY: At any point on the Company's interconnected system.

**APPLICATION**: This Schedule shall be applicable to all retail tariff Customers taking service under the terms contained in this Tariff.

MONTHLY BILL: In addition to the Monthly Charges contained in the Customer's applicable schedule, all monthly bills shall have applied an amount equal to the product of all metered kilowatt-hours multiplied by the following cents per kilowatt-hour. The prices in the column labeled "Year 1" shall be in effect for one year beginning on the effective date of this tariff. The prices in the column labeled "Year 2" shall be in effect for one year beginning at the end of Year 1. The prices in the column labeled "Year 3 and Subsequent Years" shall be in effect beginning at the end of Year 2.

		<u>Year 1</u>	Year 2	Year 3 and
				Subsequent Years
Schedule	1	0.0000 ¢	(0.4029)¢	(0.6972)¢
Schedule	6	$(0.7272)  \phi$	(0.2902)¢	0.0000¢
Schedule	6A	0.0000 ¢	(0.3908)¢	0.0000 ¢
Schedule	7	(0.6944)¢	0.0000¢	(6.5972)¢
Schedule	7A	0.0000 ¢	(0.7092)¢	(6.3830)¢
Schedule	8	(0.7457) ¢	(0.3196)¢	0.2486¢
Schedule	9	(0.7210)¢	(0.3028)¢	0.0000¢
Schedule	10	0.6497¢	0.6497¢	0.6497¢
Schedule	11	(0.7299)¢	(0.7299)¢	(8.0292)¢
Schedule	12 - Street Lighting	(0.7295)¢	(0.3127)¢	(3.4914)¢
Schedule	12 - Traffic Signal	(0.8929)¢	(0.4464)¢	(2.6786)¢
Schedule	19	(0.7048)¢	(0.2624)¢	(0.6448)¢
Schedule	23	(0.6633)¢	(0.2258)¢	(1.2871)¢
Schedule	23A	0.0000 ¢	(0.3905)¢	(1.0557)¢
Schedule	35	(0.8150)¢	(0.3260)¢	0.0000¢
Schedule	36	0.0000 ¢	(0.4019)¢	(0.2412)¢
Schedule	400 - Nu-West	(0.6764)¢	(0.2603)¢	0.0000 ¢

Submitted Under Case No. PAC-E-02-1

**ISSUED**: April 10, 2002

Case No. PAC-E-02-1 Exhibit No. 21 Witness: Robert C. Lively

## BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

## **PACIFICORP**

Exhibit No. 21 Accompanying Direct Testimony of Robert C. Lively

**Excess Power Cost Recovery** 

April 30, 2002

## PacifiCorp Excess Power Cost Recovery

